

# Letters to the Tribune's Editor

I wholly disapprove of what you say and will defend to the death your right to say it.—Voltaire to Helvetius.

Our War Motives  
Tenants' Redress

Nurses Not Profiteers  
Alcohol in Medicine

## Why America Went to War

Motives Examined by an Officer Who Served on the General Staff of the Army

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Why we went to war will probably remain a question of as much dispute as "Who struck Billy Patterson." While Mr. Harvey's statement of the reasons was crude, unfortunate and unnecessary I am of the opinion he stated substantially the fundamental reason, though there were incidental reasons that had their influence upon our action.

If we regarded ourselves as knights-errant bent upon a crusade solely in the interest of a great ideal, and seeking the redress of humanity, and the righting of wrongs that were being perpetrated, then we have by no means finished our task on the one hand, and on the other we have justified ourselves by being a party to one of the most infamous wrongs that history records.

If we fought solely for an ideal and humanity, with no selfish thought, why do we not go a step further and make war upon Japan to rescue Korea from her cruel grasp, and restore to the Koreans their own country and government, and stop their oppression and extermination that is going on under Japanese rule and exploitation? Then, too, who stilled within our representatives at the Peace Conference the spirit of the knight-errant and crusader, when they became parties to the transfer of Shantung to Japan, and betrayed poor old China, who had entered the war on the side of the Allies largely upon our inducement and representation that we would safeguard her interests?

Was this infamy perpetrated from no unselfish motives and inspired by a lofty idealism? By no means. We sacrificed the sacred territorial rights of our old-time friend and ally to placate Japan and rid ourselves of some embarrassing questions she was pressing upon us.

Coming now to the reasons that constrained us to enter the war, notwithstanding the fact that our President in the beginning of the war admonished us that its roots and causes were no concern of ours, and that we should be neutral even in thought, our people did sympathize with France and Belgium, and believed the war one of unwarranted aggression on the part of Germany for world domination. But would this sympathy alone have given our government the moral or legal right to plunge our people into the war, with all its terrible consequences, or to right a wrong we believed was being done to those countries unless that wrong potentially affected, directly or indirectly, our own rights, interests or safety?

In fact, our President, together with a tremendous element of pacifists in the country, was opposed to our entering the war at all, and this element was numerous enough to reflect him upon a platform—"He kept us out of war." And it was only by the force of events and the insistence of a few patriotic and far-seeing Americans that the Administration was finally kicked into the war.

When it comes down to the individual opinion of why we went to war the reasons will be many and oftentimes conflicting. There is but one authoritative

and official statement of the reasons, and that is contained in the resolution of the Congress, which recognized the existence of a state of war between us and Germany, which Germany had already begun against us, and pledged the resources of the nation to its successful prosecution.

This was and remains the only official statement of our reasons. It was unavoidable and sufficient, because Germany was murdering our people upon the high seas, and making war upon us in our own country by fomenting revolution and sedition in our midst and blowing up munition plants and other instrumentalities for war making all over the country.

But back of all this our people realized that if Germany won the war, as she appeared to be doing when we entered it, we would be her next victims, with all the resources of Europe at her command. It was the fear of this in the minds of our people, coupled with the state of war already existing, that prompted our entry into the war more than anything else.

The truth is that for several years past we have had an overdose of Quixotic idealism, and those in authority seem to have been more interested in humanity at large than in the rights, interest and welfare of our own country, and the results of such a policy are now seen in the utter demoralization of the social, economic, industrial and financial conditions in the United States. We take courage and thank God for the indications of a return to sane politics and a more enlightened self-interest.

In conclusion, I was one of the first to volunteer my services, and served during the war as an officer on the General Staff of our army. I believe I am an average American in intelligence and patriotism, and I want to say that, whatever may have been the motives of others, there is no doubt in my mind of the reasons why I went to war and offered my life to my country. I was influenced by no unselfish sentimentality or spirit of the crusader to right the wrongs of humanity or by such nonsense as "making the world safe for democracy" or to establish a league of nations. On the contrary, I went to war to defend my own country from the attacks that were being made upon her and because of the potential dangers that were threatening her independence and safety in the event that Germany should win the war in Europe. I was not, of course, unmindful or unfeeling by the danger threatening civilization and free governments throughout the world by the assaults Germany was making upon them.

As a matter of fact, the world, and our own country in particular, are in far more danger to-day from unbridled democracy led by a fanatical and demagogic minority than genuine democracy was ever endangered by the war. Instead of "making the world safe for democracy," our present and greatest problem resulting from the war is to "make democracy safe for the world." While I do not undertake to speak for the soldiers that filled our armies, I do believe that the foregoing represents the views of the great majority of them.

ALEXANDER SIDNEY LANIER.  
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1921.

## Maternity Bill Objections

Adverse Comment on Sheppard-Towner Measure—Fiske's Warning To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As your correspondent Mr. Rosenthal has not yet seen a valid objection to the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, I would refer him to the following. Fiske, in his Critical Period of American History, says:

"If the day should ever arrive (which God forbid!) when the people of the different parts of our country should allow their local affairs to be administered from Washington . . . on that day the progressive political career of the American people will have come to an end, and the hopes that have been built upon it for the future happiness and prosperity of mankind will be wrecked forever."

Also this from an article on "Education," by Paul L. Blakely, in America: "The State of Maryland, for instance, recently petitioned Congress to enact the outrageous Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, and among the chief grounds alleged was the fact that in one year 150 mothers had died in that state for want of proper care. If that be true have not the citizens of Maryland enough humanity and initiative to take steps to prevent an abnormally high—if such it be—death rate; or, failing private agencies of relief, cannot the State of Maryland solve the problem for itself? Is it so lost to independence that in a matter affecting the local health regulations it must immediately turn to the Federal government, thereby confessing its unfitness for self-government?"

AN INTERESTED WOMAN.  
Baltimore, Md., June 23, 1921.

## Vocal Workers

(From The Des Moines Register)  
A lot of men now standing around complaining that there is a lack of work were probably among those who stood around talking nonsense when there was plenty of work.

## Back to Normal

(From The Portland Press)  
Bryan has resumed his old rôle of a prophet. He was a dismal failure as a performer and prophecy seems more in his line.

## A Lincoln Chapel

Patriotic Memorial Planned by All Saints' Church

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is possible that many of your readers might be interested in a fact about Lincoln's New York funeral which seems to be very little known, namely, that after the body lay in state at the City Hall, where the midnight service was held, it was taken to the New York undertaker's residence, 3 Willett Street, and that the next morning before the procession started out, the body lay in state at the triangular place called Scammel Square, where Scammel Street falls into Grand, crossing East Broadway. Besides the testimony of the daughter of the undertaker, I have that of a Mr. E. Gottschalk, who remembers going up steps of the little platform by the side of the catafalque and viewing the body.

As this was right by our old church, we have felt that it would be fitting to commemorate the fact by dedicating a chapel to Lincoln in the church. We have installed a bust and have mounted on cards many precious old pictures of the occasion. We should like to enrich our collection of relics, souvenirs or letters of Lincoln, so as to increase the interest for the public school pupils and visitors who will be invited to make a pilgrimage to our chapel, especially on Lincoln's birthday.

Perhaps some owners of Lincoln souvenirs, letters or relics would like to know of some place where they will be with pious reverence preserved for patriotic purposes. Besides such mementoes we should gladly receive communications of hitherto unpublished reminiscences of Lincoln, or indeed, anything whatever that will promote the patriotic inspiration of our visitors.

Any gifts would be properly credited to the donor, and would thus form a permanent memorial to him.

REV. KENNETH SYLVAN GUTHRIE.  
Rector of All Saints' Church  
New York, June 23, 1921.

## Fatal Holidays

(From The Indianapolis News)  
A green Christmas means a fat graveyard and a fine Sunday means the same thing.

## Tenants' Protection

Need of Organization Questioned—The Court Routine To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The formation of a new protective organization for tenants raises a question which in my mind is second to none in importance in our efforts to solve the housing situation. All that such an organization could do is to defend actions for rent increases through its official legal department. My experience has been that the tenant has all the protection he could possibly derive from such legal service already.

And in most cases without the expenditure of a penny for legal advice. This is particularly true of the poorer class of apartment dwellers.

Now, how is the poorer tenant protected? When a landlord decides to increase the rent he demands his increase, sometimes giving notice in advance, as he should do; sometimes seeking a higher rent for the current month. Every tenant in New York knows to-day that he has only to refuse to pay the increase if he does not want to pay more than he has been paying. The landlord cannot put him out without going to court and having the tenant to court. The landlord causes the tenant to be served with a summons demanding the increased rent and summoning the tenant to answer in court at the clerk's office within five days.

The only intelligence required of a tenant is that he know enough to appear in court within the period stipulated in the summons. He appears at the office of the clerk, at the address given in the summons, and inquires of the employee at the window what he is to do. The clerk of the Municipal Court I have found to be the most highly efficient and uniformly willing group of city employees. They advise the tenant in a few seconds what he must do, and place the case on the court calendar, instructing the tenant to appear on a certain day and to answer when his name is called in court. No one could give other advice and be right, no matter what the fee.

At the trial, the presumption being against the landlord by express provision of law, the tenant's case is safe with the justice. The landlord must overcome with figures, and with proof of their correctness, that he is entitled to an increase in rent. Under certain conditions he gets it. More often he gets nothing in excess of the old rent, and now and then only a part of the increase. Counsel, no matter how astute, could not add to the tenant's case. A protective organization could not improve the tenant's chances of success.

K. P.  
New York, June 23, 1921.

## Ridiculous and Sublime

Artemus Ward as Preface to Emancipation Proclamation

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Apropos of your editorial "Frolicsome Man," Mr. Drinkwater's employment of a reading from Artemus Ward in "Abraham Lincoln" is not only characteristic of the Great Emancipator but authentic historically. Confirmation is furnished in a new psychoanalytic study of Lincoln. This is in Lincoln as Exhibit B (Searching for the Key to the American Mind), by Harvey O'Higgins and Edward H. Reed, M. D., in the current issue of McClure's Magazine. The authors are describing Lincoln's actions in crises: "Take him on September 22, 1862, when he called his Cabinet together to hear his proclamation freeing the slaves. The stage was set for what is called 'a historic moment,' and all recognized it as historic. Two of his Cabinet ministers wrote accounts of the meeting in their diaries that night. . . . He opened the meeting by reading to the Cabinet not a chapter from the Bible—as Bishop Fowler and others have believed—but a comical page from Artemus Ward: His Book, which the humorist had sent him. He knew the importance of the moment. He was about to announce devoutly that he was determined to free the slaves because he had promised God that he would free them if the Union armies were victorious at Antietam. He was prepared to face the opposition of his Cabinet members, a majority of whom he knew were set against issuing the proclamation. Yet, confronting this opposition, pledged to action by a covenant with God, at one of the most solemn crises of his official life, he began by reading Ward's ridiculous account of how a visitor to his wax works attacked the figure of Judas Iscariot. And this nonsense 'he seemed to enjoy very much,' as the Secretary of the Treasury wrote in his diary."

It is all strikingly like Scene IV in Drinkwater's "Abraham Lincoln." And the dramatist has put into Lincoln's mouth a speech which illuminates still more his mental processes: "It's an exciting morning, gentlemen! I feel rather excited myself. I find my mind not at its best in excitement. Will you allow me (opening his book)? It may compose us all. It is Mr. Artemus Ward's latest."

DAVID H. WALLACE.  
New York, June 23, 1921.

## Need for a Dentist

(From The Portland Press)  
The Federal government is learning what Maine found in the course of fifty years of prohibition—that the law needs a new set of teeth about every year and that it won't do for them to be false teeth, either.

## A Welcome Invasion

(From The Des Moines Register)  
A tide of German gold has replaced the tide of German steel that started toward Paris over six years ago, and there will be nothing to prevent its arrival in the French capital.

## Trained Nurses Reply

Vigorous Protests Called Forth by Letter Asking Whether They Are Profiteers

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The letter by "Brooklyn" charging the trained nurses with profiteering is one that calls for a most emphatic reply.

Strange as it may seem, there are some persons with a very poor understanding of what the term "trained nurse" really means. I know of one case where a nurse was asked if all "trained nurses were not trained to go without sleep." It is, of course, very unreasonable of the nurse to expect any time for rest and food, to say nothing of any recreation. That, of course, they do not heed!

"Brooklyn" has no doubt figured out that a nurse receives \$2,555 a year. Certainly, \$7 a day 365 days a year, less year excluded. It never entered her head that a nurse is able to work comparatively few months out of the year. Not because there is no work, but because of her health. To state a specific case, a nurse was called on a case, miles from home, worked one week and was then herself taken to the hospital stricken with scarlet fever. For days it was a question whether she would live. It cost her only about \$200 to get well, not to mention the time she lost. This is not a hypothetical case, and I state it only to show what a nurse has to contend with.

Volumes could be written about the experiences of the nurse, and I am sure they would make people realize not only that the life of a nurse is not milk and honey, but they would also learn to appreciate more the true worth of the trained nurse.

K. E. LOFGREN.  
Elizabeth, N. J., June 24, 1921.

## Fifty Cents an Hour

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will "Brooklyn" kindly explain how we of the nursing profession have "doubled our wages by cutting our time in half?" It is indeed humorous.

The private duty nurse doing twelve-hour duty gets \$6 and not \$7 a day, pays for a room in a good location, laundry, registration dues, carfare to and from the patient and keeps up a presentable appearance. In order to give her best to the profession she has to have some recreation and rest between cases, during which period she pays for her own three meals a day and there is nothing coming in.

She has put in three years of intensive training and the greater part of the \$6 a day is paid for her knowledge of how to care for a sick person intelligently.

She goes on duty at 7 or 8 in the morning until 7 or 8 at night, and it takes her from half an hour to an hour to go to and from the case, making from thirteen to fourteen hours in all. What other class of women, professional or non-professional, put in such long hours at less than 50 cents an hour?

Besides, there are many nurses who do twenty-four hour duty in private homes, with from three to four hours off duty in the afternoon and supposedly a chance for at least six hours sleep at night—all for \$7 a day.

After eight years nursing it has been my experience that those most critically ill, even though in moderate circumstances, are the most appreciative and the most willing to pay the nurse what she so deservedly earns. They would be the first to consider the term "profiteer" in connection with the nursing profession ridiculous.

A NURSE FROM CALIFORNIA.  
New York, June 24, 1921.

## Not Exempt From Living Cost

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The reason nurses have shortened their hours from twenty-four to twelve is, I think, a case of the worm turning at last. There is no other worker who accepts such a condition night and day at the task. We start out with the attitude, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me," but we have to readjust our ideas as we notice how many of our fellow workers lose their health by this foolish way of working.

Landlords and others do not accept or adopt this attitude in dealing with us. A nurse is not exempt from living costs. We still pay higher rent, laundry, board, higher percentage for getting work. Now we have the income tax added to this, and a license is demanded of us.

Our work is very uncertain. Sometimes we have little or nothing to do for months. During this time we are not exempt from paying board, and no nurse gets her salary while on vacation, as in some other lines of work.

People of moderate means can do what trained nurses do when they get ill—go to the hospital and get nursed cheaper or take out health insurance which will pay their expenses.

MANHATTAN.  
New York, June 22, 1921.

## "Only" Twelve Hours

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "Brooklyn's" accusation of the trained nurse should bring forth an outcry of righteous wrath from members of the profession and others who have a real knowledge of what a trained nurse is and does.

The trained nurse's ordinary hours of work are only twelve (note "only" twelve) and not twenty-four a day, the twenty-four hour case being the exception. For such a case it is customary for the nurse to receive \$1 more a day than for a twelve-hour one, instead of the accustomed time and a half pay allowed to laborers for overtime work.

Seven dollars and three meals a day! Yes, that is a good deal for the average

person to pay, especially when the thing for which it is paid is looked upon as being in the same class as the service of one's cook or waitress or laundress. But stop just a minute and realize that one is also paying for the three years and more of training and experience which makes the nurse rather than the housemaid the essential employee.

As for the trained nurse taking advantage of this shortage in her profession, I will merely point to her record during the war, when her services were so much more in demand. Did she strike for more pay or shorter hours? Was any profiteering done by her when everybody else, worthy and unworthy citizens alike, was grasping all the profits from the war within reach? Certainly such an idea was as far from the nurse's mind as it was from the soldier's.

The shortage of nurses is a very serious problem, but not one which is for the nursing profession alone to solve; neither is it the fault of those who are trained nurses. We who are nurses would be the first to welcome new recruits to our ranks. By all means get all the "able-bodied, intelligent women" from England or any other land to take up hospital training here. Many overworked, worried training school superintendents would be glad to have them in their schools. In that suggestion I am heart and soul with my opponent. Why doesn't he start some such immigration?

H. PERSEE BONTON.  
Willard Parker Hospital, New York,  
June 23, 1921.

## A Nurse's Day

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In answer to "Brooklyn's" query as to whether trained nurses profiteer, may I state a few facts?

I am a trained nurse of many years standing and am engaged in private nursing, mostly obstetrical work. I prefer to work twenty-four hours because I find it far easier than the so-called "twelve-hour" duty.

However, my doctors often require me to go on cases at the hospital, where I work twelve hours. In order to put in my full time I have to rise not later than 5:45 a. m. to be over to the hospital, have my breakfast and be on duty at 7 a. m.

I leave my patient's room at 7 p. m. or even later, and reach my home somewhere around 8 p. m. having had no fresh air except what I can get coming and going. As a rule one is too tired to walk either way.

For this we get \$6 a day, and when outside at a patient's house we get \$7.

Has it occurred to "Brooklyn" that a nurse has to have a permanent address, a place to live when not on a case, a telephone whereby she can be called by doctor or patient? She also must "dress for the public" in uniform, no small item in these days of profiteering; she has her laundry to pay for when on a case in town.

A nurse, if she is any good, has to be the most self-sacrificing person. She can do nothing practically outside of her particular work. Can she join any club for outdoor sports? Can she join any classes for self-improvement? Can she plan ahead for the opera, or for a wedding or for a dance? Very rarely indeed.

Girls are looking ahead now to professions and work which will lead them to something in the future. There are too many things a woman can do in these days, and unless the public begins to take a little more interest in nurses, their work, their hours and their pay I'm afraid there will still be an even greater dearth of nurses.

NEW YORK.  
New York, June 22, 1921.

## Seven Years' Preparation

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The writer of the letter "Do Trained Nurses Profiteer?" complains of trained nurses reducing their working hours from twenty-four to twelve hours a day. How can any sane being expect a nurse or anybody else to work twenty-four hours a day? I should hate to have the life of a loved one of mine depend on a nurse who had not slept or rested for a week or more, no matter how efficient she may be normally.

As for private duty nurses asking the outrageous price of \$7 a day and three meals for "only" twelve hours' duty! Has your correspondent ever given a thought to the fact that a trained nurse has sacrificed seven years of her life to gain the education necessary to become a trained nurse? Four years of high school and three years of hospital training, to be exact. Since nurses must be compared with mechanics, teamsters and tailors, how many years have they spent getting their education? They were all paid while learning, I believe. And, in spite of the nurses reducing their hours, they are still working four hours a day longer than the above mentioned classes.

There is no reason why people should have to die for the want of care, even if they can't afford to pay nurses. There are plenty of hospitals where poor people may go and get the same care for little or nothing.

The suggestion of importing nurses from the devastated regions of Europe sounds easy, but they are not ready-made nurses, and to become American-trained nurses they have a long way to go, especially if they don't speak English. And once they get here they might more than likely do as most American girls do—choose something easier which will bring them as good and perhaps better reward, and certainly more appreciation.

IDA S. OLSON, R. N.

## Assyrians in Peril

Jeopardized by Reduction of British Forces in Mesopotamia To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: England, it is reported, is shocked to learn that some 30,000 horses will have to be slaughtered when the British forces in Mesopotamia are reduced. Our own humane sentiments are also aroused by this announcement. The 70,000 people who will probably be slaughtered by this same movement seem to claim a comparatively small amount of sympathy from us.

Before the war the Assyrian race numbered about 200,000. Encouraged and incited by the British, they fought against their neighbors, the Kurds and the Persians, in support of the Allied cause. They have thereby incurred the undying enmity of those two races. Their sacrificial contribution to the Allied cause is mutely evidenced by the fact that about 30,000 of these people grouped around Mosul and Bagdad, far from their homes, are practically the only survivors. Forty thousand Armenians now at Bursa are in similar condition for the same reasons.

Last year they attempted to return to their homes, but were turned back by the Kurds. The Arabs will not permit them to remain where they are. British protection is being withdrawn. England and the United States have refused admittance to them. There is no other place for them to go. Unable to stay where they are and unable to move, their chances are almost equal to those of the proverbial snow ball on the kitchen stove.

We are not anti-British any more than we are anti-American in protesting against particular phases of our own government policy, but perhaps our humane sentiments can be aroused to the point of action by the plight of these human beings, as well as by the fate in store for 30,000 horses.

EDWARD TYLER PERRY.  
Westfield, N. J., June 23, 1921.

## The "Wet" Parade

Teetotaler Tells Why He Will March; Boston Tea Party Comparison To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: James K. Shields, in a letter to The Tribune, calls the Fourth of July parade a "wet" parade. I've been given the impression, through the press, that it is a "personal liberty" parade. I am going to parade on the Fourth, and I am a "100 per cent" teetotaler.

I am going to parade for two reasons: I cannot see the justice of being stopped by a policeman and asked "What have you in that case?" (I had a musical instrument in the case.) Having seen this done in Russia I protest it here in the United States. Then, again, I cannot see the justice of having two big policemen come over to my table in a restaurant and deliberately look into my cup of coffee to see if I was drinking "hooch." Keep this attitude up and it will turn more strictly temperate young men against this unreasonable law. Put common sense in it and I'll back the law for all it's worth.

Yes, I'm going to parade and not feel ashamed of whom I parade with, as a protest against this method of enforcing prohibition.

R. W. K.  
Brooklyn, June 23, 1921.

## Medicinal Use of Alcohol

American Medical Association Veers From Former Opposition—New York County Society Silenced

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Medical, pharmaceutical and chemical organizations, as well as individual medical men of prominence in this city, are protesting the passage of the bill supplemental to the Volstead act as destructive to medicine, chemical science and industry in this country.

At the recent meeting in Boston of the American Medical Association the House of Delegates refused to re-affirm a decision of this body made in 1917. This decision was to the effect that alcohol had neither value as a food nor merit as a remedy in disease. On the other hand, resolutions were introduced at this meeting in the section on pharmacology and therapeutics, where this subject properly belongs, declaring that this act would nullify the right of the physician to prescribe in accordance with his knowledge and his judgment and would substitute for his qualifications and experience the provisions of a statute laid down by a lay body.

While these opinions are being openly proclaimed at this time, one of the most influential and representative medical organizations in the country, the Medical Society of the County of New York, is debarred from discussing this subject. This situation has been brought about by what The Medical Record calls a "curious error." This error, so called, is founded on the decree of the comitia minora after consultation with counsel that: "The Volstead act deals with the regulation of intoxicants used for beverage purposes and not with alcohol used for therapeutic purposes, and therefore does not come within the jurisdiction of the society." Commenting on this decision, The Medical Record says: "Of course,

both the Volstead act and the proposed amendment do deal specifically with the medicinal use of alcohol, and it is incomprehensible that the council should have made such a statement or that the members of the comitia should have been willing to accept the responsibility for publishing it."

Meanwhile, the Medical Society of the County of New York, which is on record, as well as the American Medical Association on this subject, is prevented from voicing its opinion during this crisis in medical affairs. It may be stated that it was for the purpose of reaffirming the stand previously taken by the Medical Society of the County of New York that this matter was again brought before the society on April 25.

Under the recently adopted constitution of the society no matter can be debated at the time of its introduction except by consent of the president. All business, however pressing, must await the decision of the comitia minora. In this instance this body reported its findings one month after the resolutions in question were presented. The attitude previously taken on national prohibition and the Volstead act by the Medical Society of the County of New York was to the effect that as far as these measures related to medical practice they were: "Irrational, unscientific and against the accepted usage of civilized countries everywhere else throughout the world." They were also condemned as "permitting the sale of patent and proprietary alleged medicinal compounds containing alcohol in varying amounts, while denying the use of spirituous, vinous and malt alcoholic beverages of proved therapeutic worth."

JOHN P. DAVIN, M. D.  
New York, June 24, 1921.

## A Gay Mix-Up

Potpouri of Misinformation Regarding "The Beggar's Opera" To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have amused myself this afternoon by searching for more errors of statement regarding one play, Gay's "The Beggar's Opera," so recently and so variously in the public limelight. Alas, my communication of June 12 now seems colorless indeed; behold the latest findings from only a part of my clippings on the subject:

"The Beggar's Opera" was revived in London in 1919 (Boston Post), instead of 1920. It came to America after "a two years' brilliant run in London" (Musical Leader), instead of about seven months. It played in New York for eight weeks (Indianapolis Star), instead of a little over four weeks. It was written by Benjamin Gay (Chicago Tribune), instead of John. It contains sixty-eight songs (The Drama) instead of sixty-nine. Its music is "a modernized version of old English tunes by Dr. Arne, Pepusch, Handel and others of their time" (Chicago American), instead of old English ballad airs, mainly, of uncertain composition. It contains Handel's march from "Rinaldo" as a finale for the second act (Boston Post), instead of close to the beginning of that act. It had a sequel called "Polly Peachum" (Cincinnati

Commercial Tribune), instead of "Polly." This sequel was originally published by Potts, of Dublin (Chicago News), instead of Watts, of London. The actress who played the part of Polly in 1728 and became the favorite of the town was Mrs. Sallee (London Bazaar), instead of Lavinia Fenton. "Life is a jest," etc., is "a felicitous little couplet" from "The Beggar's Opera" (Detroit Free Press), instead of Gay's famous epitaph. Finally, honorable mention should go to the most startling of all the dramatical